

Serial No.: 10/058,057

--8--

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 10-17, and 19-27 are currently pending in the application. By this amendment, claims 3 and 18 are cancelled without prejudice, claims 1-2 and 10-17 are amended and claims 19-27 are newly added for the Examiner's consideration. Support for the amendment(s) and added claims is provided in at least the originally filed claims, Figures 2, 4 and 9, and related text of the present specification. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the rejected claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Objection to Specification

The declaration was objected to as being defective. Attached hereto is a revised declaration complying with the requirements set forth in the 37 C.F.R. §1.67.

Objection to Specification

The specification has been objected to for containing an abstract having more than one hundred fifty words (150). Applicants provide an amended abstract containing less than the one hundred fifty words (150).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the objection to the abstract be withdrawn.

Objection to Claims

Claims 3 and 18 were objected to for allegedly failing to limit the subject matter of the previous claim. Claims 3 and 18 have been canceled and renders the objection moot.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the objection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejection

Claims 1-3, 10-15 and 17-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) for being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 5,733,491 issued to Grosset, et al. ("Grosset"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single prior art reference must describe each and every element as set forth in the subject claim. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). That is, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). *See also* Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) § 2131 (8th Ed., Aug. 2001). A *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been established as Grosset fails to teach each and every element as set forth in claim 1.

Grosset shows in FIGS. 1-2 a plurality of dies, for example, dies 34, 32, 36, 38, 40 and 42 arranged in a liner fashion to form a distribution channel 76 and outlet end 30. It is these dies, distribution channel and the outlet end that extrude material onto the surface of the product. This is quite different than that of the claimed invention.

Also, Grosset fails to teach each and every element as set forth in claim 10. Again, Grosset requires a plurality of dies 34, 32, 36, 38, 40 and 42 arranged in a liner fashion for forming distribution channel 76 and outlet end 30. The grooves 75a and 75b are required in order to prevent second plastics from flowing backwards, while the other features provide the second material to the product during the extrusion process. In contrast, the present invention of claim 10 requires

a die having a synthetic resin passage that receives synthetic resin installed at an outlet of an extruder [and a] second inlet is formed at one side of the die to feed a second synthetic resin thereto, and the second inlet is formed to communicate with a second passage in communication with the synthetic resin passage of the die so that the second synthetic resin is coated on a surface of the product.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, and claims 2-3, which depend from claim 1, are allowable. Additionally, claim 10, and claims 11-16 and 18, which depend from claim 10, are also allowable.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being unpatentable over Grosset in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,672,303 issued to Metzger, et al. ("Metzger"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 16, by virtue of its dependency from claim 10, includes all the features of claim 10 and should be allowable over the applied art of record for the above reasons. Additionally, Metzger fails to cure the deficiencies of Grosset.

Additionally, Grosset requires grooves 75a and 75b in order to prevent second plastics from flowing backwards. *See* col. 7, lines 35-40. This is not required by the invention and the invention would solve this problem with the passageways of the claimed invention. .

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Other Matters

In this response, claims 19-27 are newly added in order to capture the subject matter of the invention from different perspectives. These claims 19-27 are directed to the features fully described in the specification but not disclosed or suggested in the art of record.

Serial No.: 10/058,057

--11--

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all of the claims are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below, if needed. Applicant hereby makes a written conditional petition for extension of time, if required. Please charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 29-1951.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott J. Hawranek
Registration No. 52,411
Andrew M. Calderon
Registration No. 38,093

McGuireWoods, LLP
Suite 1800
1750 Tysons Blvd.
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 712-5426

\\COM\294033.1